UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/761,849 | 01/20/2004 | Kuldeep Jain | 871.0119.U1(US) | 3072 |

29683 7590 03/12/2010

HARRINGTON & SMITH
4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| PATEL, DHAIRYA A | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2451 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 03/12/2010 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/761,849 | JAIN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Dhairya A. Patel | 2451 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 October 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,13-22 and 25-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,13-22,25-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action responsive to pre-appeal request filed on 10/15/2009. Claims 1-10,13-22,25-40 are subject to examination. Claims 11-12, 23-24 are cancelled.

2. Applicant's argument has been fully considered and entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

***Claims 1-4,7,9-10,13-16,19,21-22,25-28,30,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch et al. U.S. Patent # 6,768,726 (hereinafter Dorenbosch) in view of Phillips et al. U.S. Patent # 6,370,399 (hereinafter Phillips) further in view of Bright et al. U.S. Patent # 7,206,574 (hereinafter Bright)***

As per claim 1, Dorenbosch teaches a method comprising: initiating the set up of an internet protocol connection between a mobile station (Fig. 2 element 203) and a computing device (Fig. 2 element 209) (column 5 lines 43-55), the internet protocol connection being one that terminates at the mobile station (Fig. 2 element 203)(column 6 lines 4-16)(column 9 lines 10-18), the initiation of the set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command over a local interface between the mobile station and the computing

device (column 17 lines 25-35);

**NOTE:** The reference teaches initiating the first internet protocol connection between the first station (mobile station) through gateway and to the second station (computing device) by using the first IP address where the gateway does address translation and protocol translation, SCTP to and from TCP/UDP and relays the packet data to and from second station (IP connection between a mobile station and a computing device). In column 9 lines 10-18, and Fig. 2, it can be seen that IP connection terminates at the mobile station since there is no other connection after that.

-establishing the internet protocol connection between the mobile station and the computing device comprising the mobile station assigning an internet protocol address to the computing device (column 5 lines 44-67), and configuring an internet protocol stack at the mobile station (column 10 lines 59-65); and where communication between the mobile station and the computing device occur over the internet protocol connection using the local interface and where the local interface is at least one of a short range infrared, universal serial bus, and Bluetooth interface (column 4 lines 49-61)

Dorenbosch does teach initiation of the set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command over a local interface between mobile station and computing device but is silent in teaching command from the computing device over a local interface between mobile station and the computing device. Dorenbosch is also silent in teaching in response to receiving over the internet protocol connection, an internet protocol message at

the mobile station from the computing device, routing the received internet protocol message to an application that is resident in the mobile station.

Phillips teaches initiation of the set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command from computing device over a local interface between mobile station and computing device (column 4 lines 8-36). **NOTE:** The reference teaches receiving a command string which is the AT dial command from the TE device by the user (i.e. computing device) over dial-up interface.

Phillips also teaches in response to receiving over the internet protocol connection an internet protocol message at the mobile station from the computing device, routing the received internet protocol message to an application that is resident in the mobile station (column 4 lines 32-44). **NOTE:** The reference also teaches configuring TCP-based connection the MT device (mobile station) configures TCP protocol by opening a connection specifying the IP will be used to message transport. The IP protocol transmits the TCP packets to the IP address and send a connect message to the TE device and connect message then prompts the communication application (received IP message to the application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Phillips's teaching in Dorenbosch's teaching to come up with having receiving command from the computing device over the local interface and receiving internet protocol message at mobile station and routing the message to an application. The

motivation for doing so would be to establish a TCP/IP connection based on the connect message signal, therefore data packet transfer from the mobile terminal to the TE device can take place with ease.

Dorenbosch and Phillips does not teach assigning internet protocol address to the mobile station. Bright teaches assigning internet protocol address to the computing device (column 4 lines 60-65)(column 10 lines 7-18, lines 29-31) and assigning internet protocol address to the mobile station (column 4 lines 60-67)(column 10 lines 5-6). Bright also teaches communication between the mobile station and the computing device occur over the internet protocol connection using the local interface and where the local interface is at least one of a short range infrared, universal serial bus, and Bluetooth interface (column 4 lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bright's teaching in Dorenbosch and Phillips teaching to come up with assigning IP address to the computing device and the mobile station and communicating between mobile station and computing device using Bluetooth interface. The motivation for doing so would be to establish a link between the mobile station and the computing device therefore computing device can access internet through the mobile station, by communicating with the mobile station through Bluetooth.

As per claim 2, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but Phillips further teaches where the command is an AT command (column 4 lines 19-27).

As per claim 3, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but Phillips further teaches where the command is an AT+CRM command (column 8 lines 8-14).

As per claim 4, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but Phillips where the command is an AT+CRM command having a value of five (Fig. 6)(column 4 lines 58-61).

As per claim 7, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but Phillips further teaches where the command is an ATSO=1 command (Fig. 4 element "description 1 "packet data service, relay layer"")(column 4 lines 48-57).

As per claim 9, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but Dorenbosch further teaches where the local interface comprises a wired interface (column 4 lines 49-61)

As per claim 10, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but Dorenbosch further teaches where the local interface comprises a wireless interface (column 4 lines 49-61)

As per claim 13, Phillip teaches a computer readable medium within a mobile station embodying a computer program executable by a process to perform action, comprising: responsive to a receipt of a command over a local interface (column 17 lines 25-35, initiating the set up of an internet protocol connection between the computing device and the mobile station (column 5 lines 43-55) where the internet protocol connection terminates at the mobile station (Fig. 2 element 203)(column 6 lines 4-16)(column 9 lines 10-18)

**NOTE:** The reference teaches initiating the first IP connection between the first station (mobile station) through gateway and to the second station (computing device) by using the first IP address where the gateway does address translation and protocol translation, SCTP to and from TCP/UDP and relays the packet data to and from second station (IP connection between a mobile station and a computing device). In column 9 lines 10-18, and Fig. 2, it can be seen that IP connection terminates at the mobile station since there is no other connection after that.

-establishing the internet protocol connection between the mobile station and the computing device comprising the mobile station assigning an internet protocol address to the computing device (column 5 lines 44-67), and configuring an internet protocol stack at the mobile station (column 10 lines 59-65); and

Dorenbosch does teach initiation of the set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command over a local interface between mobile station and computing device but is silent in teaching command from the computing device over a local interface between mobile station and the computing device. Dorenbosch is also silent in teaching in response to receiving over the internet protocol connection an internet protocol message at the mobile station from the computing device, routing the received internet protocol message to an application that is resident in the mobile station.

Phillips teaches initiation of the set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command from computing device over a local interface

between mobile station and computing device (column 4 lines 8-36). **NOTE:** The reference teaches receiving a command string which is the AT dial command from the TE device by the user (i.e. computing device) over dial-up interface.

Phillips also teaches in response to receiving over the internet protocol connection an internet protocol message at the mobile station from the computing device, routing the received internet protocol message to an application that is resident in the mobile station (column 4 lines 32-44). **NOTE:** The reference also teaches configuring TCP-based connection the MT device (mobile station) configures TCP protocol by opening a connection specifying the IP will be used to message transport. The IP protocol transmits the TCP packets to the IP address and send a connect message to the TE device and connect message then prompts the communication application (received IP message to the application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Phillips's teaching in Dorenbosch's teaching to come up with having receiving command from the computing device over the local interface and receiving IP message at mobile station and routing the message to an application. The motivation for doing so would be to establish a TCP/IP connection based on the connect message signal, therefore data packet transfer from the mobile terminal to the TE device can take place with ease.

Dorenbosch and Phillips does not teach assigning internet protocol

address to the mobile station.

Bright teaches assigning internet protocol address to the computing device (column 4 lines 60-65)(column 10 lines 7-18, lines 29-31) and assigning internet protocol address to the mobile station (column 4 lines 60-67)(column 10 lines 5-6). Bright also teaches communication between the mobile station and the computing device occur over the internet protocol connection using the local interface and where the local interface is at least one of a short range infrared, universal serial bus, and Bluetooth interface (column 4 lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bright's teaching in Dorenbosch and Phillips teaching to come up with assigning IP address to the computing device and the mobile station and communicating between mobile station and computing device using Bluetooth interface. The motivation for doing so would be to establish a link between the mobile station and the computing device therefore computing device can access internet through the mobile station, by communicating with the mobile station through Bluetooth.

As per claims 14-16, 19, 21-22, teaches same limitations claims 2-4, 7, 9-10 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 25, Dorenbosch teaches an apparatus comprising: at least one data processor (Fig. 2 element 203 i.e. mobile terminal); and at least one memory including computer program code, where the at least one memory and the computer program code are configured with at the at least one data processor (column 15 lines 47-56), to cause the apparatus to at least

:communicate over a local interface (i.e. wireless interface) and over a wireless communication network, the processor further configured to initiate setup of an Internet Protocol connection between said apparatus and a computing device (Fig. 2 element 209) (column 5 lines 43-55) with a command over the local interface (column 17 lines 25-35), where the internet protocol connection terminates at the apparatus (Fig. 2 element 203)(column 6 lines 4-16)(column 9 lines 10-18).

**NOTE:** The reference teaches initiating the first IP connection between the first station (mobile station) through gateway and to the second station (computing device) by using the first IP address where the gateway does address translation and protocol translation, SCTP to and from TCP/UDP and relays the packet data to and from second station (IP connection between a mobile station and a computing device). In column 9 lines 10-18, and Fig. 2, it can be seen that IP connection terminates at the mobile station since there is no other connection after that.

- establish the internet protocol connection between the apparatus and the computing device comprising the assigning an internet protocol address to the computing device and an internet protocol to the apparatus (column 5 lines 44-67), and configuring an internet protocol stack at the apparatus (column 10 lines 59-65); and

Dorenbosch does teach initiate set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command over a local interface between apparatus and computing device but is silent in teaching command from the computing device

over a local interface between apparatus and the computing device. Dorenbosch is also silent in teaching in responsive to receiving an internet protocol message from the computing device over said local interface, the processor is configured to route the received internet protocol message to an application that is resident in a memory of said apparatus.

Phillips teaches initiate set up of the internet protocol connection comprising receiving a command from computing device over a local interface between apparatus and computing device (column 4 lines 8-36). **NOTE:** The reference teaches receiving a command string which is the AT dial command from the TE device by the user (i.e. computing device) over dial-up interface.

Phillips also teaches in responsive to receiving an internet protocol message from the computing device over said local interface, the processor is configured to route the received internet protocol message to an application that is resident in a memory of said apparatus (column 4 lines 32-44). **NOTE:** The reference also teaches configuring TCP-based connection the MT device (mobile station) configures TCP protocol by opening a connection specifying the IP will be used to message transport. The IP protocol transmits the TCP packets to the IP address and send a connect message to the TE device and connect message then prompts the communication application (received IP message to the application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Phillips's teaching in Dorenbosch's teaching to come up with having receiving command from the

computing device over the local interface and receiving IP message at apparatus and routing the message to an application. The motivation for doing so would be to establish a TCP/IP connection based on the connect message signal, therefore data packet transfer from the mobile terminal to the TE device can take place with ease.

Dorenbosch and Phillips does not teach assigning internet protocol address to the mobile station.

Bright teaches assigning internet protocol address to the computing device (column 4 lines 60-65)(column 10 lines 7-18, lines 29-31) and assigning internet protocol address to the mobile station (column 4 lines 60-67)(column 10 lines 5-6). Bright also teaches communication between the mobile station and the computing device occur over the internet protocol connection using the local interface and where the local interface is at least one of a short range infrared, universal serial bus, and Bluetooth interface (column 4 lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Bright's teaching in Dorenbosch and Phillips teaching to come up with assigning IP address to the computing device and the mobile station and communicating between mobile station and computing device using Bluetooth interface. The motivation for doing so would be to establish a link between the mobile station and the computing device therefore computing device can access internet through the mobile station, by communicating with the mobile station through Bluetooth

As per claims 26-28,30, it teaches same limitation as claims 2-4,7

therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 30, Dorenbosch and Phillips teaches an apparatus as in claim 25, but Phillips further teaches where the command is an ATSO=1 command (column 1 lines 18-36).

As per claim 31, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches an apparatus as in claim 25, Bright further teaches where said local interface comprises at least one of a wired interface and a wireless interface (column 4 lines 65-67) and where the assigned internet protocol addresses are assigned arbitrarily to the apparatus to the computing device (column 4 lines 60-65)(column 10 lines 5-18, lines 29-31).

***Claims 5,6,8,17,18,20,29,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch et al. U.S. Patent # 6,768,726 (hereinafter Dorenbosch) in view of Phillips et al. U.S. Patent # 6,370,399 (hereinafter Phillips) further in view of Bright et al. U.S. Patent # 7,206,574 (hereinafter Bright) further in view of Lim et al. U.S. Patent # 6,349,224 (hereinafter Lim)***

As per claim 5, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 3, but Phillips further teaches further comprising:

-sending an ATD #777 command to the mobile station from the computing device over the local interface to establish a call (column 4 lines 19-24); and establishing the internet protocol connection over the local interface (column 2 lines 37-56). Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright fails to teach performing peer-to-peer protocol negotiations over the local interface. Lim teaches performing peer-

to-peer protocol negotiations over the local interface (claim 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Lim's teaching in Dorenbosch and Phillips's teaching to come up with performing peer-to-peer protocol negotiations over local interface. The motivation for doing so would be to directly communicate with each other between mobile terminal and devices i.e. the peer terminals to convey the protocol context information.

As per claim 6, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches a method as in claim 1, but are silent in teaching further teaches where the command places the mobile station into an auto-answer mode. Lim teaches command places the mobile station into an auto-answer mode (column 6)(Table 1 element "S0=0 to FF). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Lim's teaching in Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright's teaching to come up with having command places the mobile station into auto-answer mode. The motivation for doing so would be to answer the call, automatically if a fax, async data were to be received at the mobile station, therefore if the call was not answered and error AT command would not be sent out (Table 2).

As per claim 8, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Lim teaches a method as in claim 6, but Dorenbosch teaches establishing internet protocol connection over the local interface using arbitrary internet protocol addresses from the mobile station and the computing device (column 4 lines 28-49). Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright are silent in teaching in response to an occurrence of a trigger signal at the

mobile station, sending a ring signal to the computing device over the local interface to establish a call and establishing the internet protocol connection over the local interface, performing peer-to-peer protocol negotiations over the local interface.

Lim further teaches further comprising: in response to an occurrence of a trigger signal at the mobile station, sending a ring signal to the computing device over the local interface to establish a call and establishing the internet protocol connection over the local interface (column 4 lines 59-66) performing peer-to-peer protocol negotiations over the local interface (claim 25).

It would have to been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Lim's teaching in Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright's teaching to come up with establishing internet protocol connection over the local interface by using arbitrary internet protocol addresses and performing peer-to-peer negotiation and sending a ring signal to establish call. The motivation for doing so would be so that after establishing a call the mobile phone through the wireless communication being assigned the IP address is able to communicate with the other mobile stations/phones and data terminals through IP addresses.

As per claims 17,18, 20 respectively, it teaches same limitation as claims 5,6,8 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 29, it teaches same limitations claim 6, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 32, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches an apparatus as in claim 25, but fails to teach wherein internet protocol connection is used by the apparatus to execute peer-to-peer application with the computing device. Lim teaches wherein internet protocol connection is used by the apparatus to execute peer-to-peer application with the computing device (claim 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Lim's teaching in Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright's teaching to come up with execute peer-to-peer application with computing device. The motivation for doing so would be to directly communicate with each other between mobile terminal and devices i.e. the peer terminals to convey the protocol context information.

***Claims 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch et al. U.S. Patent # 6,768,726 (hereinafter Dorenbosch) in view of Phillips et al. U.S. Patent # 6,370,399 (hereinafter Phillips) further Bright et al. U.S. Patent # 7,206,574 (hereinafter Bright) further in view of Cui et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2004/0204069 (hereinafter Cui)***

As per claim 32, Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright teaches an apparatus as in claim 25, but fails to teach where the internet protocol connection is used by the apparatus to execute a peer-to-peer application with the computing device. Cui teaches internet protocol connection is used by the apparatus to execute a peer-to-peer application with the computing device (Paragraph 29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention was made to implement Cui's teaching in Dorenbosch, Phillips and Bright's teaching to come up with having internet protocol connection using peer-to-peer application. The motivation for doing so would be one could share data with the mobile device and the computing device using the same peer-to-peer application which allows a user to share or distribute data.

As per claim 33, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 32, but Cui further teaches where the peer-to-peer application comprises a Personal Information Management application (Paragraph 37)(Paragraph 38)

As per claim 34, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 32, but Cui further teaches where the peer-to-peer application comprises one that enables data to be transferred from the apparatus to the computing device for storage (Paragraph 27)

As per claim 35, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 34, but Cui further teaches where the data comprises data generated by a camera of the apparatus (Paragraph 27).

As per claim 36, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 32, but Cui further teaches where the peer-to-peer application comprises one that enables data to be transferred from the computing device to the apparatus for storage (Paragraph 27)

As per claim 37, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 36, but Cui further teaches where the data comprises music data (Paragraph 27).

As per claim 38, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 32, but Cui further teaches where the peer-to-peer application comprises a synchronization application (Paragraph 37)(Paragraph 38).

As per claim 39, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 32, but Cui further teaches where the peer-to-peer application comprises a parameter provisioning application (Paragraph 37)(Paragraph 40).

As per claim 40, Dorenbosch, Phillips, Bright and Cui teaches an apparatus as in claim 32, but Cui further teaches where the peer-to-peer application comprises a debugging application (Paragraph 37)(Paragraph 51).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10,13-22,25-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's remarks in regards to Dorenbosch does not teach "where communication between the mobile station and the computing device occur over the internet protocol connection using the local interface and where the local interface is at least one of a short range infrared, universal serial bus, and Bluetooth interface" is deemed non-persuasive.

In response to above mentioned applicant's remark, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in column 4 lines 49-61, Dorenbosch states where communication between the mobile station and the computing device occur over the internet protocol connection using the local interface and where

the local interface is at least one of a short range infrared, universal serial bus, and Bluetooth interface (column 4 lines 49-61).. Furthermore, In column 4 lines 37-41, Dorenbosch teaches the second IP connection using second IP address for the router via a basic service set, thus wireless IP access point. Furthermore, that IP connection via cellular system and another (i.e. second station) via a wireless IP access point according to various known standards and technologies such as HiperLan, Bluetooth. Therefore Dorenbosch teaches the claimed limitations.

Furthermore, Bright reference also teaches the same limitation as stated above in this office action.

***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A). " Cellular telephone interface system for AMPS and CDMA data services" by Willkie et al. U.S. Patent # 5,96,651.

B). " Voice to Digital Fax Transmission" by Wang et al. U.S. Patent # 6,230,024 by Wang et al. U.S. Patent # 6,230,024.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairya A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00AM-4: 30PM, first Fridays OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DAP

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451